

AD-A207 432

DTIC FREE COPY

(4)

ASSESSMENT OF COMMITMENT TO
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY GOALS IN THE MILITARY

by

Carl A. Bartling, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology
Arkansas College
Batesville, Arkansas

for

The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida

United States Navy-ASEE 1988
Summer Faculty Research Program

Report #: DEOMI-88-3

September 30, 1988

DTIC
SELECTED
11 APR 1989
S E D
CSE

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author and should not be construed as an official Department of Defense or Department of the Navy position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS										
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited (Statement A)										
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)										
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) DEOMI-88-3		6b. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Carl A. Bartling Arkansas College										
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Psychology Department Arkansas College Batesville, Arkansas 72501		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) RM&S										
7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research (ONR)		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Code 01122 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217										
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION OASD (FM&P)		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) DSAM										
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) OASD (FM&P) (RM&S) Pentagon Washington, DC 20301		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER DSAM 80012										
10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 92198D		PROJECT NO. MP 808										
		TASK NO. 2										
		WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.										
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Assessment of Commitment to Equal Opportunity Goals in the Military (UNCLASSIFIED)												
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Carl A. Bartling												
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final		13b. TIME COVERED 1988 FROM 30 May TO 6 Aug										
14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 880930		15. PAGE COUNT 36										
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Prepared as a part of the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) summer program in conjunction with OASD, ONR and American Society for Engineering Education.												
17. COSATI CODES <table border="1"><tr><th>FIELD</th><th>GROUP</th><th>SUB-GROUP</th></tr><tr><td>05</td><td>08</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>05</td><td>09</td><td></td></tr></table>		FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	05	08		05	09		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Equal opportunity; affect; attitude measurement; affective measurement; cognition; motivation; discrimination; racism; free-recall	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP										
05	08											
05	09											
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) <p>The purpose of this study was to assess the commitment to equal opportunity (EO) goals by students training to be military EO advisors at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI). This included the measurement of the validity and reliability of DEOMI's attitude instrument, the Interpersonal Skills Development Evaluation (ISDE). The research paradigm used focuses on attitude measurement through the interrelationships of affective, motivational, and cognitive variables (cf. Klinger, 1988). Cue words associated with various categories, including EO issues (e.g., discrimination, racism), were presented to DEOMI students and rated on association with current concerns and emotional arousal evoked (two variables related to goal commitment). After the ratings, students were asked to recall (unexpected free-recall) as many of these words as they could. The relative ratings and relative free-recall for the EO words were not signifi-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">CONTINUED ON REVERSE</p>												
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED										
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL DEOMI/DE, Lt Col Dansby		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (407) 494-2746										
22c. OFFICE SYMBOL DE												

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE~~

19. Cantly correlated with the ISDE ratings for the DEOMI students. Reliability of the ISDE was shown to be moderately low. Suggestions for improving the validity and reliability of the ISDE are offered. (See)

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE~~

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the commitment to equal opportunity (EO) goals by students training to be military EO advisors at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI). This included the measurement of the validity and reliability of DEOMI's attitude instrument, the Interpersonal Skills Development Evaluation (ISDE). The research paradigm which was used focuses on attitude measurement through the inter-relationships of affective, motivational, and cognitive variables (cf. Klinger, 1988). Cue words associated with various categories, including EO issues (e.g., discrimination, racism), were presented via slides to the DEOMI students and rated by them on their association with their current concerns and emotional arousal evoked (two variables related to goal commitment). After rating the presented words, students were asked to recall (unexpected free-recall) as many of these words as they could. Degree of relative ratings and degree of relative free-recall of the EO cues were postulated as being indicative of the degree of commitment to EO goals, an important component of the ISDE. The relative ratings and relative free-recall for the EO words, however, were not significantly correlated with the ISDE ratings for the DEOMI students (lack of support for the construct validity of the ISDE). Reliability of the ISDE was shown to be moderately low (e.g., mean interrater reliability for seven pairs of trainers who rated their separate groups of trainees was only .58). Suggestions for improving the validity and reliability of the ISDE are offered in this study (e.g., train raters to reduce response sets that restrict the range of scores produced with the ISDE).

ASSESSMENT OF COMMITMENT TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY GOALS IN THE MILITARY

One of the evaluation problems facing the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) is the assessment (validity and reliability) of the group trainers' ratings of students' commitment to the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all people serving in the military. Part of this evaluation problem stems from the fact that the DEOMI students, who are in training to be Equal Opportunity (EO) advisors, vary greatly in terms of their perceptions of how voluntary or involuntary their participation in the DEOMI training program is. For example, one would expect more resistance to attitude change (e.g., engendering increased commitment to equal opportunity in the military) when a student perceives his or her participation in the DEOMI training program as being predominantly involuntary.

The small-group trainers are responsible for making judgments about students' commitment to the basic goals of the training program using the Interpersonal Skills Development Evaluation (ISDE), which is comprised of 11 elements each rated on a 0-6 Likert-type scale. These judgments to a certain extent are subjective and not perfectly reliable or consistent across different trainers rating the same students (two trainers and 10 to 15 students per training group). This evaluation process is also complicated by the fact that students typically are socialized over several weeks of training to emit the "proper" verbal and overt behaviors. Thus, assessments of attitude changes (e.g., affective changes) are partly based on very subjective criteria (e.g., nonverbal behaviors). One line of research that has attempted to address these and related problems involves the study of the interrelationships among affective, motivational, and cognitive processes (cf. Klinger, 1988). Klinger (1971, 1975, 1977, 1988) has emphasized the heuristic construct which he calls "current concern." A "current concern" is defined as "the internal state corresponding to an unmet goal..." (Klinger, 1988). Goal commitment is tied to the construct of current concern by means of words or cues that are associated with the goal of interest. For example, if a DEOMI student were to identify cue words such as "equality" and "discrimination" as being closely related to his or her current concerns, the implication would then follow that the person is more likely to be committed to equal opportunity goals than someone who did not identify these cue words as being associated with his or her current concerns.

Prior to the recent research by Klinger and others on current concerns, Cook and Sellitz (1964) presented a set of suggestions concerning ways to measure attitudes. These suggestions included techniques in which inferences are drawn from performance of "objective" tasks. The basic assumption is that the performance on "objective" tasks may be influenced by attitudes, and that systematic differences in performance across individuals reflect the influence of different attitudes. For example, if a memory task were used, the assumption is that the material consistent with an individual's own attitudes will be learned better. Support for this basic assumption has been established for some time (e.g., Levine & Murphy, 1943, using material about the Soviet Union; and with statements about segregation, Jones & Kohler, 1958).

Of particular interest is the finding that people may pay attention to, remember, and spend time thinking about cues that are related to their current concerns more than they do with cues that are less related to their current concerns (e.g., Bock & Klinger, 1986; Harkness, DeBono, & Borgida, 1985; Hoelscher, Klinger, & Barta, 1981; Klinger, 1978). In related research, it has been shown that people have a tendency to attend to, think about, and remember emotionally arousing words more than other words (e.g., Bock & Klinger, 1986; Nielsen & Sarason, 1981; Schneider, 1987).

Thus, it would seem feasible to try to assess students' commitment to various types of goals by having them rate their emotional arousal and association with current concerns when shown words that are cues or associated with particular goals. Some type of memory task (e.g., free recall) then could be used to assess the validity of an individual's ratings of the cues in terms of emotional arousal and association with current concerns (cf. Bock & Klinger, 1986). It should also be pointed out that there is a strong positive relationship between the measures of emotional arousal and current concern (Klinger, 1988).

This line of research is indirect in terms of assessing attitudes, affective objectives, and goal commitment. However, it should be kept in mind that all measures of attitudes and related concepts, including observation of overt behavior, are indirect and involve assumptions by the researcher and interested reader. Nevertheless, this research approach (measurement of current concerns and emotional arousal) should provide evidence pertaining to the ability of trainers to make subjective judgments and DEOMI students' commitment to EO goals in the military.

METHOD

Subjects

The second training class of 1988 at DEOMI served as participants in this study. There were 84 students who participated. These 84 students possessed the following characteristics: 73 males and 11 females; 23 Black, 5 Hispanic, 52 White, 2 American Indians, and 2 Asian-Americans; 66 serving in the Army and 18 serving in one of the other military service branches.

Procedure

Overview. The basic approach followed in this study was to present a set of individual words from various conceptual categories (e.g., words associated with EO issues) to the DEOMI students. The students were to rate each presented word in terms of association with their current concerns and emotional arousal evoked. An unexpected free-recall task followed the rating task. Additionally, various attitudinal questions were included in the study (e.g., perception of extent of voluntary participation in the DEOMI training program).

Details. The 84 students who participated in the study were divided into two groups of approximately equal numbers (random assignment of half of the students from each training group to two testing groups for the study). An attitude survey (see Appendix 1) and other procedures were administered to these two groups of student participants in the DEOMI auditorium. Different word lists were used for the two groups for purposes of conceptual replication (see Appendix 2 for word lists used). Otherwise, materials and procedures were identical for the two groups of students.

Typed research booklets were used for all instructions and study tasks except for the presentation of the words to be rated by the students. Each set of 30 words (8 EO words, 8 words from each of two other categories, and 3 primacy and 3 recency filler items) was presented visually via 35 mm slides at the rate of 15 seconds/word. The specific order of instructions and tasks used are shown in Appendix 3.

As each word was presented, the students rated each word on 5-point Likert-type scales for the degree of association with current concerns that they may have and amount of emotional arousal evoked or experienced. Following the word-rating task, students were instructed to write down in any order all of the just-presented words they could remember. Five minutes were allowed for this unexpected free-recall task.

Additional attitudinal measures followed, with questions about demographic and background information after these attitudinal measures. The DEOMI students were then debriefed and finally materials were collected.

Each of the DEOMI students met periodically in small groups of approximately 14 students that had two trainers. Each of the two trainers used 7-point Likert-type scales (see Appendix 4) to rate each of the students in his or her group on 11 attitudinal objectives related to commitment to EO goals. The composite average on this 11-item scale, Interpersonal Skills Development Evaluation (ISDE), was used as one of the criterion variables in this study.

Students were also tested at the end of each of their seven training blocks with multiple-choice tests. These academic test scores were also used as criterion variables.

RESULTS

Validation of Research Paradigm: Ratings of Current Concerns and Emotional Arousal

Predicting relative recall of words associated with EO issues. Ratings of current concerns and emotional arousal were averaged across the 8 words in a given category and across the 24 words in a given list for each participant (recency and primacy filler words not included). These two averages (per list and per category) were then used to derive relative measures for the current concerns and emotional arousal ratings for the various categories of words. The same process was used to derive relative recall measures for the words from each of the different categories (e.g., EO words). See Table 1 for these averages.

The relative measure of current concerns for the EO words was predictive of the relative free-recall of the EO words ($r = .34$, $p = .002$). The relative measure of emotional arousal for the EO words was also predictive of the relative free-recall of the EO words ($r = .36$, $p = .001$). These results lend support to the validity of the research approach used.

Predicting relative recall of words from the other categories. The relative measures of current concerns and emotional arousal were used to predict the corresponding relative free-recall measures for the other four categories. These correlations were statistically significant for the Military category and for the Punishment category (r_s ranged from .32 to .41), but not for the Romance & Affection category nor for the Neutral words category (r_s ranged from .00 to .19). See Table 2 for this list of comparisons and corresponding correlations.

Table 1

**Current Concerns, Emotional Arousal, and Relative
Free-Recall: Means and Standard Deviations**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Current Concerns</u>		<u>Emotional Arousal₁</u>		<u>Relative Current Concerns</u>		<u>Relative Emotional Arousal₁</u>		<u>Relative Free-Recall</u>	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Word List (n = 81)	2.72	.76	2.88	.70	--	--	--	--	--	--
EO Words ^a (n = 81)	3.61	.97	3.49	.87	1.35	.27	1.24	.24	.34	.11
Romance & Affection (n = 40)	2.74	.87	3.33	.84	.91	.17	1.04	.21	.39	.13
Military (n = 40)	2.64	.73	2.76	.70	.88	.15	.86	.17	.33	.13
Punishment (n = 41)	1.95	.96	2.56	.96	.79	.21	.99	.20	.30	.15
Neutral Words (n = 41)	1.73	.67	1.66	.64	.72	.17	.66	.17	.31	.13

^aEO Words are the words associated with equal opportunity issues.

Table 2

Predictions of Relative Free-Recall of Words from Each Category

<u>Word Category</u>	<u>Predictors</u>			
	<u>Relative Current Concerns</u>		<u>Relative Emotional Arousal</u>	
	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Probability^a</u>	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Probability^a</u>
Equal Opportunity (n = 81)	.34	.002	.36	.001
Romance & Affection (n = 40)	.00	1.00	.09	.58
Military (n = 40)	.34	.03	.32	.04
Punishment (n = 41)	.35	.02	.41	.01
Neutral Words (n = 41)	.00	1.00	.19	.24

^aProbabilities are not corrected for the number of comparisons made.

Relationships among ratings of current concerns and emotional arousal. The corresponding measures of current concerns and emotional arousal were significantly correlated at the level of the 24-word list ($r = .74$) and for each of the various categories (r_s ranged from .47 for the Punishment category to .91 for the Neutral words category). These results are also consistent with past research using measures of current concerns and emotional arousal (e.g., Bock & Klinger, 1986). See Table 3 for specific correlations of interest.

Construct Validity of the ISDE: Use of Various Predictors

EO relative recall scores. The EO relative free-recall scores were not predictive of the trainers' ratings of the DEOMI students' attitudes using the ISDE scores ($r = .01$). This was the most important comparison in the study concerning the construct validity of the ISDE.

Academic test scores. The scores the DEOMI students received on their academic tests were not significantly correlated with their corresponding ISDE scores ($r = .16$, $p = .15$).

Ratings of current concerns and emotional arousal. Although they were not all statistically significant, every measure of current concerns and emotional arousal showed an inverse relationship with the ISDE measure. For purposes of comparison, the corresponding correlations with the students' academic test scores (test given nearest in time to research study of students) are included (see Table 4). As with the ISDE, every measure of current concerns and emotional arousal showed an inverse relationship with the students' academic test scores. These correlations were generally highest with the list measures, Neutral-words measures, and EO-words measures.

Comparing ISDE scores across branch, sex, and race of students. Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed on the students' ISDE scores, and on the students' academic test scores for purposes of comparison, for the category variables of military branch of service, sex, and race. The scores for the students serving in the Army were compared with the scores for the students in the other military service branches (combined together in a single group) because of the small numbers of students from each of the other service branches. This type of comparison was made more meaningful by the fact that students from the other service branches rated their participation ($\bar{X}_{\text{non-Army}} = 4.72$) in the DEOMI training program as being more voluntary on a 5-point Likert-type scale than did the students who were serving in the Army ($\bar{X}_{\text{Army}} = 3.86$, $F_{(1,82)} = 18.04$, $p = .0001$).

Table 3

Relationship between Ratings of
Current Concerns and Emotional Arousal

<u>Word Category</u>	<u>Correlations Per Type of Comparison</u>	
	<u>Mean Current Concern vs. Mean Emotional Arousal</u>	<u>Relative Current Concerns vs. Relative Emotional Arousal</u>
Word List (n = 81)	.74	--
Equal Opportunity (n = 81)	.70	.83
Romance & Affection (n = 40)	.68	.77
Military (n = 40)	.67	.88
Punishment (n = 41)	.61	.47
Neutral Words (n = 41)	.91	.70

Note: All correlations are statistically significant at the .01 level (uncorrected for number of correlations computed).

Table 4

Correlations (Σ) and Probabilities (P): ISDE Ratings & Academic Test Scores vs. Ratings of Current Concerns & Emotional Arousal

<u>Word Category</u>	<u>Mean Current Concerns</u>				<u>Mean Emotional Arousal</u>			
	<u>ISDE</u>		<u>Test</u>		<u>ISDE</u>		<u>Test</u>	
	Σ	P	Σ	P		Σ	P	
Word List (n = 81)	-.22	.04	-.33	.003	-.27	.01	-.28	.01
Equal Opportunity (n = 81)	-.21	.06	-.24	.03	-.09	.42	-.28	.01
Romance & Affection (n = 40)	-.13	.42	-.22	.17	-.13	.44	-.10	.55
Military (n = 40)	-.06	.70	-.17	.30	-.04	.80	-.16	.31
Punishment (n = 41)	-.17	.29	-.39	.01	-.22	.17	-.18	.26
Neutral Words (n = 41)	-.44	.004	-.38	.01	-.44	.004	-.30	.05

Note: Probabilities are not corrected for the number of comparisons made.

None of the ANOVA on the ISDE scores and academic test scores reached statistical significance ($F_s < 1$) except for the ANOVA on the academic test scores with race as the category variable ($F_{(4, 79)} = 2.76$, $p = .025$). Since most of the 84 students who participated considered themselves as being either Black ($n = 23$) or White ($n = 52$), a t-test was used to compare these two racial groups on the academic test scores. The academic test scores were higher for the White students ($X_W = 91.8$) than for the Black students ($X_B = 87.7$, $t(73df) = 3.12$, $p = .001$). It should also be noted, however, that the White students reported having more years of formal education ($X_W = 13.7$ years) than did the Black students ($X_B = 13.0$ years, $t(73df) = 1.73$, $p = .04$).

Reliability of the ISDE

The two trainers in a given training group typically discuss the evaluations together and arrive at joint ratings for the students in their group. For purposes of evaluating reliability of the ISDE, trainers unofficially rated their trainees separately between the fourth and fifth official rating sessions with the ISDE.

Interrater reliability. The composite scores from the trainers' ratings of the 11 elements of the ISDE were used to calculate Pearson correlation coefficients for each of the seven pairs of trainers. The average correlation coefficient was .58, with a low of .29 and a high of .91. Five of the seven correlation coefficients were in the range from .53 to .62. This measure of interrater reliability would appear to be somewhat low when you consider the fact that each pair of trainers had four sessions where they had gotten together to jointly rate the students in their training group.

Consistency of ISDE scores. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed on students' successive official ISDE scores (i.e., 1 vs. 2, 2 vs. 3, and 3 vs. 4). These r values were .47, .48, and .48. These relatively low correlations suggest at least two potential conclusions. First, test-retest reliability may be relatively low with the ISDE. Second, students' performance across successive training blocks may not be highly consistent. To assess the relative merit of these two potential conclusions, measures of students' consistency of performance across training blocks were calculated using their academic test scores.

Intertest consistency. The DEOMI students took seven academic tests. Scores on successive tests were used to compute Pearson correlations to indicate the extent of intertest consistency. The six correlation coefficients ranged from .43 to .60. From this range of correlation coefficients one may conclude that students' performances are only moderately consistent over the 16-week training period.

Correspondence between trainers' ratings. Each rating of a student's attitude on an element of the ISDE was compared across the student's two trainers to form a difference score. These difference scores typically ranged in value from 0 to 2. Mean difference scores per ISDE element/per pair of trainers were calculated. The mean difference scores for the ISDE ratings ranged from .09 to 1.29, and were significantly different across the seven pairs of trainers, $F_{(6,70)} = 6.11$, $p < .0001$. These mean difference scores, however, were not significantly different across the 11 ISDE elements, $F_{(10,66)} = .35$.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of Data Analyses

It should be noted that the probabilities reported for the data analyses in the Results section are not corrected for the numbers of analyses performed to hold the experiment-wise error rate to a constant. Also, the correlation coefficients reported are based on relatively small sample sizes (i.e., 40 to 84 pairs of scores). Therefore, it may be useful for the interested reader to set a relatively conservative standard (e.g., $p = .01$) when interpreting the level of statistical significance reported for a given test. Fortunately, however, many of the important conclusions to be drawn from this study are based on patterns of statistical analyses (e.g., sets of correlations) and not upon isolated comparisons. Most of the other important conclusions are based on analyses which are either clearly statistically significant or clearly nonsignificant.

Validation of Research Paradigm

Results supported the basic validity of the research paradigm employed. For example, the relative measures of current concerns and emotional arousal for the EO words were both predictive of the relative free-recall of the EO words ($r_s = .34$ and .36, respectively; and $p_s = .002$ and .001, respectively). This was in spite of the fact that a social desirability demand characteristic restricted the range of scores for the ratings of current concerns and emotional arousal for the EO words.

Construct Validity of the ISDE

There was little support found for the construct validity of the ISDE. The most important comparison was between the relative free-recall measure for the EO words and the ISDE ($r = .01$). If scores on the ISDE represent degree of commitment to EO goals, there should have been a significant relationship between the ISDE and the relative free-recall measure for the EO words. However, if the ISDE scores primarily represent degree of commitment to performing well in the DEOMI training program, then the r value of .01 mentioned above is understandable and expected.

The consistent pattern of an inverse relationship between the ISDE (and the academic test scores) and various measures of current concerns and emotional arousal (see Table 4) does not lend any real support to the construct validity of the ISDE. The most reasonable interpretation of this pattern of results is that the students who were doing less well on either the ISDE or on the academic tests were simply more apprehensive about being evaluated. Thus, they would have rated words (including ostensibly neutral words) higher in terms of current concerns and emotional arousal. Students doing well in the training program would have less reason to be apprehensive about being evaluated.

The relative measures of current concerns and emotional arousal for the EO words were not significantly correlated with the ISDE ($r_s = .16$ and $.08$, respectively). However, they were in the positive direction as would be expected in order to support the construct validity of the ISDE.

There was also a nonsignificant correlation found between the ISDE and the academic test scores ($r = .16$, $p = .15$). Since these two types of measures represent considerably different processes, one probably should not expect a high correlation between them. However, if there were a significant component of commitment to EO goals present in both measures, one might reasonably expect a moderate, yet statistically significant, correlation between the ISDE and the academic test scores. Mean scores on the academic tests ranged from 90% to 92% and students who did not score at least 70% were required to take make-up tests to bring their test scores up to 70%. Thus, there was a restriction of range problem with the academic test scores, as with the ISDE ratings, which would make it more difficult to show a statistically significant correlation between these two measures if in fact one did exist.

Reliability of the ISDE

From the various analyses reported (e.g., mean interrater reliability of $.58$), it would appear that there is only a moderate amount of reliability produced with the ISDE. This was in spite of the fact that pairs of trainers had four previous sessions of jointly discussing and jointly rating their sets of trainees. This level of reliability may have made it more difficult to demonstrate construct validity with the ISDE.

Normally one would place greater emphasis on the criterion validity of an instrument such as the ISDE. However, there are a number of obstacles that prevent the accurate measurement of performance of the EO advisors once they leave the DEOMI training and take up their field assignments (Hope, 1979; Landis, Hope, & Day, 1984). Therefore, it becomes even more important to be able to demonstrate reliability and construct validity with the ISDE.

A number of reasons may be suggested as to why only a moderate amount of reliability was found with the ISDE. First, trainers appear to use various types of response sets (e.g., moderate scoring) that restrict the range of scores with the ISDE. Some trainers show zero variability across their trainees with certain rating elements of the ISDE. Some trainers show zero variability across rating elements for many of the trainees they rate. In general, there appears to be a narrow range of scores that are normatively expected to be given out by trainers on a given set of ratings (e.g., mostly 4s and 5s on the 0-6 point scale). As mentioned in the Results section, there were no significant differences across the variable of ISDE element for the ratings given.

These various response sets may stem partly from perceptions held by the trainers about the underlying goals of the ISDE rating system. With this system it is important to identify students who have "outstanding" or "unsatisfactory" performance. However, it is less important to distinguish among the majority of the trainees who are in the middle of the distribution. The rating instrument itself gives considerable information about standards at both extremes, but is less clear about explaining the differences in the midrange scale values.

The difficulty of accurately evaluating 10-15 trainees on 11 separate elements and the time involved in trying to do this thoroughly and accurately should be pointed out as potentially important factors also.

Suggestions for Improvements

Decide upon evaluation goals. The first step that needs to be taken is to decide whether or not accurate measurement of all students' attitudes is an important goal. Even if the primary focus is on the evaluation of "outstanding" and "unsatisfactory" performance in the training program, it would seem important to establish a more accurate process to assess all students' attitudes.

Additional training for trainers. Improvements in the measurement of students' attitudes should result if trainers are provided additional training in the rating of students with the ISDE (e.g., ways to avoid various types of response sets). There was a wide range of values on the interrater reliability coefficients (.29 to .91) and a statistically significant difference on the correspondence scores per pair of trainers. These results lend support to the argument that many trainers could benefit from additional training in the use of the ISDE.

Reduce number of ISDE elements. If the number of elements in the ISDE were reduced it would be easier for the trainers to accurately rate students' attitudes. As it is now, few trainers appear to be using 11 independent elements when they rate their trainees.

Separate ratings. It is important for each trainer to rate his or her trainees separately instead of jointly with the other trainer assigned to the same training group. This would provide continuing opportunities to assess the reliability of the ISDE and to ascertain which pairs of trainers are most likely to benefit from additional training in the use of the ISDE. However, adjustments need to be made so that this will not burden trainers in terms of time required to rate their trainees.

Build in contingencies. Contingencies could be built into the DEOMI training program to make midrange scores on the ISDE more meaningful. This would have the effect of increasing the consistency of students' performances within the training groups and on their academic tests as well.

Modify selection process. It was a common recommendation from the DEOMI students to modify the selection of students to the DEOMI training program (e.g., make the selection process for Army trainees more voluntary). Many students felt that the ISDE simply measures the role-playing ability of students, but does not accurately reflect students' real attitudes. This process of role playing is probably more dominant if the majority of the DEOMI students are selected rather than being allowed greater opportunity to volunteer for this training assignment.

Additional conceptual analyses of the ISDE (e.g., factor analyses of the ISDE elements in terms of types of attitudes being assessed) may allow DEOMI to decide which elements of the ISDE are most important. W. K. Gabrenya (personal communication, July, 1988) is in the process of conducting such analyses with the ISDE.

Reduce forced compliance. It may be informative to experiment with reducing the forced-compliance nature of the attitude measurement process. This would require a shift in evaluation emphasis. Specifically, one could evaluate the training process and its overall effectiveness better while deemphasizing the evaluation of the individual student. In such a case, attitude measurement may more accurately reflect commitment to EO goals rather than commitment to performing well in the DEOMI training program.

Establish criterion validity. Although it may appear impractical, ideally it would be extremely valuable to assess the criterion validity of various phases of the DEOMI training pro-

gram. One of the difficult aspects of this process would involve obtaining the cooperation of unit commanders in carrying out such a research project.

Study commanding officers. There may be nearly complete agreement among military personnel that commanding officers play a vital role in establishing the EO climate in their units. What may be less obvious is the considerable impact that commanding officers have on the DEOMI students training to be EO advisors. From interviews with DEOMI students it would appear that these students have different views about the relevance of EO advisors, which are dependent upon their branch of service and other such variables (e.g., geographic area of assignment). If the attitudes of commanding officers concerning EO advisors and EO issues are not amenable to scientific study, one could still study the perceptions of EO advisors concerning commanding officers and their impact on EO issues. If a DEOMI student were highly cynical about the importance of EO advisors and the roles they play in the military, his or her attitude and performance in the DEOMI training program and subsequent assignment may be significantly influenced.

Replicate research findings. As with nearly all scientific research it is important to replicate findings from a given single study. This study is no exception. Fortunately, part of the replication process could be carried out with existing data from previous DEOMI classes (e.g., correlations between ISDE ratings and academic test scores).

Other research paradigms. It is also important to develop or seek other research methods to assess the validity and reliability of the ISDE or whatever attitudinal instrument is adopted to assess the DEOMI students. For example, one could use peer ratings at the end of a given training cycle and compare these peer ratings with the trainers' ratings of students.

References

- Bock, M., & Klinger, E. (1986). Interaction of emotion and cognition in word recall. Psychological Research, 48, 99-106.
- Cook, S. W., & Sellitz, C. (1964). A multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 36-65.
- Harkness, A. R., DeBono, K. G., & Borgida, E. (1985). Personal involvement and strategies for making contingency judgements: A stake in the dating game makes a difference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 22-32.
- Hoelscher, T. J., Klinger, E., & Barta, S. G. (1981). Incorporation of concern- and nonconcern-related stimuli into dream content. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90, 88-91.
- Hope, R. O. (1979). Racial strife in the U. S. military. New York: Praeger.
- Jones, E. E., & Kohler, R. (1958). The effects of plausibility on the learning of controversial statements. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 57, 315-320.
- Klinger, E. (1971). Structure and functions of fantasy. New York: Wiley.
- Klinger, E. (1975). Consequences of commitment to and disengagement from incentives. Psychological Review, 82, 1-25.
- Klinger, E. (1977). Meaning and void: Inner experience and the incentives in people's lives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Klinger, E. (1978). Modes of normal conscious flow. In K. S. Pope & J. L. Singer (Eds.), The stream of consciousness: Scientific investigation into the flow of human experience. New York: Plenum.
- Klinger, E. (1988). Emotional mediation of motivational influences on cognitive processes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago.
- Landis, D., Hope, R. O., & Day, R. (1984). Training for desegregation in the military. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact. New York: Academic Press.

Levine, J. M., & Murphy, G. (1943). The learning and forgetting of controversial material. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 38, 507-517.

Nielsen, S. L., & Sarason, I. G. (1981). Emotion, personality, and selective attention. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 945-960.

Schneider, W. (1987). Ablenkung und Handlungskontrolle: Eine 'kognitiv-motivationale Perspektive' (Distraction and action control: A "cognitive-motivational perspective"). Unpublished diploma thesis, University of Bielefeld, West Germany.

Appendix 1

Study of DEOMI Students' Attitudes

General Instructions and Introduction

We'd like your help in a study of DEOMI students' attitudes by Dr. Carl Bartling, associate with the summer faculty research program at DEOMI. The purpose of this study is to better understand attitudes about DEOMI training and related issues.

As in most studies of this type, it is important to get the complete cooperation of participants in the study. We'd like you to try to adopt a positive attitude about providing information, read all instructions carefully, and attempt to answer all questions asked of you as honestly and frankly as you can.

Let me assure you that the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. No one except the primary researcher, Dr. Bartling, will have access to these research forms. Only general summary statistics and other general conclusions will be conveyed to others concerning this study.

To ensure confidentiality, but still allow Dr. Bartling to match all your response sheets together, we will assign you an arbitrary code number from the research study booklet (upper right hand corner of this page). Please print your name and the code number on your research study booklet together on the 3x5 card provided. Again, no one except Dr. Bartling will have access to this personal information.

Please read instructions provided for each section of your research study booklet carefully before providing the information requested or engaging in the specific tasks described. Do not turn the pages of the research study booklet until being told to do so.

After all of the current DEOMI students have finished providing information in this study, you will be briefed on the study and given an opportunity to ask any questions that you may have about it.

Thanks for your assistance and cooperation with this important study.

Dr. Carl Bartling
Summer Faculty Researcher

Listing of CURRENT CONCERNS

Try to reflect back over the past thirty-six hours. What CURRENT CONCERNS have you spent time thinking about over this time period? These CURRENT CONCERNS may have included (for example): things you VALUE most, ANTICIPATION of events that are likely to occur in the near or distant future, THREATS (e.g., threatened relationships), FRUSTRATIONS you may experience, CHALLENGES you may face, or other NON-ROUTINE events.

As best you can, try to jot down a word or two that summarizes each of the CURRENT CONCERNS you recall spending time thinking about recently - approximately over the past thirty-six hours. You do not need to elaborate on any of your CURRENT CONCERNS, but simply list them.

CURRENT CONCERNS of mine have been: _____

Affective Intensity Measure

Rate the extent to which you think you experience emotions such as hope, joy, fear, disappointment, relief, and other emotions. Circle the number below next to the description that you think fits you best.

- 1 = I consider myself to be ALMOST TOTALLY UNEMOTIONAL. It is very rare that I'll notice an emotional reaction in myself to anything that I experience.
- 2 = I consider myself to be LESS EMOTIONAL THAN the AVERAGE person. However, there are times when I react emotionally to experiences I have.
- 3 = I consider myself to be AVERAGE in terms of the extent of emotional reactions that I experience.
- 4 = I consider myself to be MORE EMOTIONAL than the average person. However, there are times when I do not react emotionally when others might in similar situations.
- 5 = I consider myself to be a HIGHLY EMOTIONAL person. I notice myself reacting emotionally, even to seemingly unimportant events on occasion.

Concern Measure

Rate the extent to which you think you spend time thinking about things that may concern you, including: things you VALUE most, ANTICIPATION of events that are likely to occur in the near or distant future, THREATS (e.g., threatened relationships), and FRUSTRATIONS you may experience. Circle the number below next to the description that you think fits you best.

- 1 = I do not let anything bother me. I spend ALMOST NO TIME thinking about things that may be concerns of mine.
- 2 = I OCCASIONALLY find myself thinking about current concerns that I have. However, I feel that I do this less than the average person.
- 3 = I consider myself about AVERAGE in terms of spending time thinking about things that concern me.
- 4 = I FREQUENTLY find myself thinking about current concerns that I have, and probably do this more than the average person.
- 5 = I consider myself to be a HIGHLY REFLECTIVE person. I spend a considerable amount of time thinking about things that concern me.

Instructions for Word-Rating Task

Please read the following instructions thoroughly and carefully. You will see a set of thirty words. Each word will be presented individually on a video slide projected onto a screen. Your task is to rate each word you see on two dimensions. These rating dimensions are: (1) the extent to which a given word is associated with, or evokes, a CURRENT CONCERN that you may have; and (2) the amount of EMOTIONAL AROUSAL evoked upon seeing a given word on a slide.

Each rating dimension will consist of a five-point scale anchored by adjectives on a continuum from VERY LOW to HIGH. Thus, for each word you see, you are asked to circle a number from 1-5 on each of the two rating dimensions (CURRENT CONCERN, EMOTIONAL AROUSAL). The following are examples:

#	Word on Slide	Rating Dimension	Rating Scale			
			VERY LOW	LOW	MEDIUM	MODERATE
1.....	erotic.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....
		EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....
2.....	lawn.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....
		EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....

Depending upon your own goals, needs, attitudes, and experiences you could rate either "erotic" or "lawn" on the CURRENT CONCERN dimension anywhere from 1 (VERY LOW extent of association) to 5 (HIGH extent of association with a CURRENT CONCERN). The same is true for the EMOTIONAL AROUSAL dimension. However, many individuals may have a tendency to rate "erotic" higher than "lawn" in terms of evoking a feeling of EMOTIONAL AROUSAL. But, for someone who just spent two hours in the hot sun mowing their lawn the reverse may be true in terms of evoking EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.

To help you establish your own standards or guidelines for these two scales, try to think of a word that would fit each of the two extreme scores (1 [VERY LOW] and 5 [HIGH]) on each of the two rating dimensions for you and write them in the spaces provided below:

<u>Rating Dimension</u>	<u>Your Example</u>	<u>Your Example</u>
CURRENT CONCERN	1 (VERY LOW) = _____	5 (HIGH) = _____
EMOTIONAL AROUSAL	1 (VERY LOW) = _____	5 (HIGH) = _____

Keep in mind that there are no "right" or "wrong" responses in terms of the ratings of the words on the two dimensions. What is important is how you feel about each of the words that you will be rating!

Word-Rating Task

Again, you are to rate each of the words you see on the slides on the following two dimensions: (1) the extent to which a given word is associated with, or evokes, a CURRENT CONCERN that you may have; and (2) the amount of EMOTIONAL AROUSAL evoked upon seeing a given word on a slide.

# of Word on Slide	Rating Dimension	Rating Scale				
		VERY LOW	LOW	MEDIUM	MODERATE	HIGH
1.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
2.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
3.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
4.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
5.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
6.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
7.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
8.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
9.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
10.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
11.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
12.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
13.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5

TURN TO NEXT PAGE

Word-Rating Task (continued)

<u># of Word</u>	<u>Rating Dimension</u>	<u>Rating Scale</u>				
<u>on Slide</u>		VERY LOW	LOW	MEDIUM	Moderate	HIGH
14.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
15.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
16.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
17.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
18.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
19.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
20.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
21.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
22.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
23.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
24.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
25.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
26.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
27.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5

TURN TO NEXT PAGE

Word-Rating Task (continued)

<u># of Word on Slide</u>	<u>Rating Dimension</u>	<u>Rating Scale</u>				
		VERY LOW	LOW	MEDIUM	MODERATE	HIGH
28.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
29.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
30.....	CURRENT CONCERN.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
	EMOTIONAL AROUSAL.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5

Free Recall Task

Write down in the spaces provided below as many of the words that you can recall from those you just saw presented on slides. The order in which you write them down is not important.

1. _____

16. _____

2. _____

17. _____

3. _____

18. _____

4. _____

19. _____

5. _____

20. _____

6. _____

21. _____

7. _____

22. _____

8. _____

23. _____

9. _____

24. _____

10. _____

25. _____

11. _____

26. _____

12. _____

27. _____

13. _____

28. _____

14. _____

29. _____

15. _____

30. _____

Participation & Advancement

Rate the extent to which you feel your participation in the sixteen-week DEOMI training program is voluntary or involuntary. Circle the number next to the description below that best fits how you feel about your participation.

- 1 = My participation is COMPLETELY INVOLUNTARY! I am simply following orders, and I have openly expressed negative feelings about my assignment to this training program.
- 2 = My participation is PRIMARILY INVOLUNTARY. I am following orders, but I have NOT openly expressed any negative feelings about my assignment to this training program.
- 3 = My participation is PARTLY VOLUNTARY. I probably could have avoided this training assignment if I had complained enough about it, but I chose to go along with this training assignment.
- 4 = My participation is PRIMARILY VOLUNTARY. I did NOT initiate a request for this training assignment, but I was in favor of accepting the assignment once I was informed about it.
- 5 = My participation is COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY! I initiated a request for this training assignment, and my feelings are generally positive about my being assigned to this training program.

Rate the extent to which you feel that your chances for advancement in the military will be improved or hurt by your training to be, and your serving as, a unit Equal Opportunity Officer (or NCO). Circle the number next to the description below that best fits how you feel about this issue.

- 1 = It is VERY LIKELY TO HURT my chances for advancement in the military.
- 2 = It MAY POSSIBLY HURT my chances for advancement in the military.
- 3 = It is NOT LIKELY TO INFLUENCE my chances for advancement in the military one way or the other.
- 4 = It MAY POSSIBLY IMPROVE my chances for advancement in the military.
- 5 = It is VERY LIKELY TO IMPROVE my chances for advancement in the military.

Past & Present Views on EO Goals

Think back to your first day of your sixteen-week training program at DEOMI to become an Equal Opportunity Officer (or NCO). At that point, what were your views concerning the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all people serving in the military? Circle the number beside the description below that best fits how you felt about these goals on your first day of training at DEOMI.

- 1 = My views then were CLEARLY OPPOSED to the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 2 = My views then were SOMEWHAT OPPOSED to the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 3 = I had NO OPINION concerning the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 4 = I was SOMEWHAT IN FAVOR of the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 5 = I was STRONGLY IN FAVOR of the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all people serving in the military.

How do you currently feel about the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all people serving in the military? Circle the number beside the description below that best fits how you currently feel about these goals.

- 1 = I currently hold views which are CLEARLY OPPOSED to the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 2 = I am currently SOMEWHAT OPPOSED to the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 3 = I have NO OPINION concerning the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 4 = I am SOMEWHAT IN FAVOR of the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the military.
- 5 = I am STRONGLY IN FAVOR of the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all people serving in the military.

Demographic & Background Information

For each of the questions below circle the number beside the answer that you feel best fits your response to the given question.

1. Are you male or female?

1 = FEMALE

2 = MALE

2. What was your age on your last birthday?

Enter age in years _____

3. Do you consider yourself to be a(n):

1 = AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE

2 = ASIAN AMERICAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER

3 = BLACK (NON-HISPANIC)

4 = HISPANIC

5 = WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)

6 = OTHER/UNKNOWN

4. What is your current marital status?

1 = SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED

2 = MARRIED

3 = DIVORCED

4 = SEPARATED

5 = WIDOWED

6 = OTHER

5. What is the highest grade or year of school or college that you have completed and gotten credit for?

07 = LESS THAN 8th GRADE

15 = 3rd YEAR OF 4-YEAR COLLEGE

08 = 8th GRADE

16 = 4th YEAR OF 4-YEAR COLLEGE

09 = 9th GRADE

17 = 5th YEAR COLLEGE/1st YEAR GRADUATE
OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

10 = 10th GRADE

18 = 2nd YEAR GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL
SCHOOL

11 = 11th GRADE

19 = 3rd YEAR GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL
SCHOOL

12 = 12th GRADE

20 = MORE THAN 3 YEARS GRADUATE/
PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

13 = 1st YEAR COLLEGE/VOCATIONAL,
BUSINESS OR TRADE SCHOOL

14 = 2nd YEAR COLLEGE/VOCATIONAL,
BUSINESS OR TRADE SCHOOL

Demographic & Background Information (continued)

6. In which branch of the military are you currently serving or working for (if you are a civilian employee)?

1 = AIR FORCE

2 = ARMY

3 = COAST GUARD

4 = MARINE CORPS

5 = NAVY

7. What is your current rank in the military, or civil service rating (if you are a civilian employee)?

1 = O1 5 = E5 9 = E9

2 = O2 6 = E6 10 = OTHER, Specify _____

3 = O3 7 = E7

4 = O4 8 = E8

8. If you are currently in the military, how many years of active military service do you have?

Enter number of years _____

9. If you are currently a civilian employee, how many years of civil service experience do you have?

Enter number of years _____

Appendix 2

Word-Rating Task: Word ListsWord List #1

<u>Cat.</u>	<u>Word</u>
f	1. shoe
f	2. roof
f	3. paper
EO	4. equality
SMR	5. embrace
M	6. honor
M	7. infantry
SMR	8. divorce
EO	9. justice
EO	10. prejudice
SMR	11. love
SMR	12. body
M	13. combat
M	14. promotion
EO	15. minority
EO	16. bigotry
M	17. stockade
SMR	18. caress
SMR	19. romance
M	20. warfare
EO	21. harass
SMR	22. perfume
EO	23. culture
M	24. rifle
EO	25. racism
M	26. medal
SMR	27. massage
f	28. shovel
f	29. ladder
f	30. shrub

Word List #2

<u>Cat.</u>	<u>Word</u>
f	1. tree
f	2. paper
f	3. chair
EO	4. opportunity
N	5. book
P	6. prison
P	7. criminal
N	8. door
EO	9. discriminate
EO	10. fairness
N	11. pencil
N	12. telephone
P	13. punishment
P	14. police
EO	15. race
EO	16. sexism
P	17. trial
N	18. window
N	19. tape
P	20. scold
EO	21. bias
N	22. paint
EO	23. demean
P	24. demote
EO	25. ethnic
P	26. reprimand
N	27. glass
f	28. flour
f	29. lamp
f	30. shirt

Categories: f = filler items, EO = equal opportunity, SMR = sex, marriage, romance

M = military, N = neutral items, P = punishment

Appendix 3

Specific Order of Instructions and Tasks Used

1. General introduction and emphasis on confidentiality.
2. Listing of current concerns.
3. Affective intensity measure.
4. Concern measure.
5. Instructions for word-rating task.
6. Word-rating task (15 seconds/word).
7. Free recall of word list (5 minutes).
8. Rating of voluntary/involuntary participation in DEOMI training.
9. Rating of chances for advancement in the military.
10. Past and present views on equal opportunity goals.
11. Demographics and background information.
12. Debriefing of DEOMI students.
13. Collection of materials.

Training Group #: -----

Student's Name: -----

Trainer # (Circle #): 1 2

Rating Scale

Element #

Rating Scale

		Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
(1)	1A and Conduct	Displays Professional Appearance	0	1	2	3	4	5
(2)	1B	Fulfills Training Responsibilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
(3)	2A	Demonstrates Active Participation	0	1	2	3	4	5
(4)	2B	Performs Task Functions	0	1	2	3	4	5
(5)	2C	Performs Maintenance Functions	0	1	2	3	4	5
(6)	2D	Gives, Solicits, and Receives	0	1	2	3	4	5
(7)	2E	Displays Effective Communications	0	1	2	3	4	5
		Skills Including Empathic Verbal Expression, Effective Listening and Effective Questioning Techniques						
(8)	3A	Exhibits Non-Discriminatory and Anti-Discriminatory Behavior Based on Race and Ethnicity	0	1	2	3	4	5
(9)	3B	Exhibits Non-Discriminatory and Anti-Discriminatory Behavior Based on Gender	0	1	2	3	4	5
(10)	3C	Exhibits Non-Discriminatory and Anti-Discriminatory Behavior Based on Religion	0	1	2	3	4	5
(11)	3D	Exhibits Cross-Cultural Adaptability ..	0	1	2	3	4	5